arXiv:1607.01670v1 [hep-ph] 6 Jul 2016

The Banks-Zaks expansion in perturbative QCD: an update

P. M. Stevenson

T.W. Bonner Laboratory, Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Rice University, Houston, TX 77251, USA

Abstract:

The recent QCD calculations of the five-loop β-function and of $R_{e^+e^-}$ to $O(\alpha_s^4)$ provide one more term in the Banks-Zaks expansion in $(16\frac{1}{2} - n_f)$. There is no longer any hope that the expansion could extend, even crudely, to low n_f. Above $n_f \sim 9$, however, the results appear to be reasonably consistent from order to order.

This Letter is to update earlier work [1, 2], taking into account the new results of Baikov, Chetyrkin, and Kühn for the fifth-order β function [3] and for $R_{e^+e^-}$ at fourth order [4]. Contrary to our original hopes, the Banks-Zaks (BZ) expansion [5]-[7] appears to break down around $n_f \sim 9$ or sooner, and does not extrapolate, even crudely, to low n_f.

We write the β function in the form:

$$\beta\left(a\right) \equiv \mu \frac{da}{d\mu} = -ba^2 \left(1 + ca + c_2 a^2 + c_3 a^3 + c_4 a^4 + \ldots\right) , \tag{1}$$

where $a \equiv \alpha_s/\pi$. The coefficients, in the $\overline{\rm MS}$ scheme, are [8]-[11],[3]:

$$\begin{aligned}
2b &= 11 - \frac{2}{3} n_f \,, \\
8bc &= 102 - \frac{38}{3} n_f \,, \\
32bc_2 &= \frac{2857}{2} - \frac{5033}{18} n_f + \frac{325}{54} n_f^2 \,, \\
128bc_3 &= \left(\frac{149753}{6} + 3564\zeta_3\right) - \left(\frac{1078361}{162} + \frac{6508}{27}\zeta_3\right) n_f \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{50065}{162} + \frac{6472}{81}\zeta_3\right) n_f^2 + \frac{1093}{729} n_f^3, \\
512bc_4 &= \left(\frac{8157455}{16} + \frac{621885}{2}\zeta_3 - \frac{88209}{2}\zeta_4 - 288090\zeta_5\right) \\
&\quad + \left(-\frac{336460813}{1944} - \frac{4811164}{81}\zeta_3 + \frac{33935}{6}\zeta_4 + \frac{1358995}{27}\zeta_5\right) n_f \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{25960913}{1944} + \frac{698531}{81}\zeta_3 - \frac{10526}{9}\zeta_4 - \frac{381760}{81}\zeta_5\right) n_f^2 \\
&\quad + \left(-\frac{630559}{5832} - \frac{48722}{243}\zeta_3 + \frac{1618}{27}\zeta_4 + \frac{460}{9}\zeta_5\right) n_f^3 + \left(\frac{1205}{2916} - \frac{152}{81}\zeta_3\right) n_f^4 .
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here ζ_s is the Riemann zeta-function and n_f is the number of massless quark flavours.

For n_f just below $16\frac{1}{2}$, the β function has a zero at $a^* \sim -\frac{1}{c}$, and a^* is asymptotically proportional to $(16\frac{1}{2} - n_f)$. Its limiting form,

$$a_0 \equiv \frac{8}{321} \left(16\tfrac{1}{2} - n_f\right) , \tag{3}$$

is the natural expansion parameter for the BZ expansion [1]. To proceed, one re-writes all perturbative coefficients, eliminating n_f in favour of a_0. The first two β-function coefficients, which are renormalization-scheme (RS) invariant, become:

$$b = \frac{107}{8} a_0, \qquad c = -\frac{1}{a_0} + \frac{19}{4}. \tag{4}$$

Within the class of so-called 'regular' schemes [7, 1], which includes $\overline{\rm MS}$, perturbative coefficients have a polynomial dependence on n_f, and we may write

$$c_i = \frac{1}{a_0}\left(c_{i,-1} + c_{i,0}a_0 + c_{i,1}a_0^2 + \ldots\right). \tag{5}$$

The coefficients, in $\overline{\rm MS}$, are collected in the table below.

$c_{1,0}$	=	$\frac{19}{4}$	=	4.75
$c_{2,-1}$	=	$-\left(\frac{8}{107}\right)\left(\frac{37117}{768}\right)$	=	−3.61
$c_{2,0}$	=	$\frac{243}{32}$	=	7.59
$c_{2,1}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)\left(\frac{325}{192}\right)$	=	22.6
$c_{3,-1}$	=	$\left(\frac{8}{107}\right)\left(\frac{53981}{1152} + \frac{5335}{32}\zeta_3\right)$	=	18.5
$c_{3,0}$	=	$-\frac{1544327}{13824} - \frac{16171}{288}\zeta_3$	=	−179
$c_{3,1}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)\left(\frac{2587}{96} + \frac{809}{144}\zeta_3\right)$	=	451
$c_{3,2}$	=	$-\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)^2\left(\frac{1093}{3456}\right)$	=	−56.6
$c_{4,-1}$	=	$\left(\frac{8}{107}\right)\left(\frac{1081830511}{663552} + \frac{17251949}{13824}\zeta_3 - \frac{191675}{192}\zeta_5\right)$	=	156.7
$c_{4,0}$	=	$-\frac{1452057293}{1327104} - \frac{48015}{512}\zeta_4 - \frac{4489165}{27648}\zeta_3 + \frac{856625}{2304}\zeta_5$	=	−1005.3
$c_{4,1}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)\left(\frac{33737869}{221184} + \frac{16171}{512}\zeta_4 - \frac{176837}{2304}\zeta_3 - \frac{88415}{2304}\zeta_5\right)$	=	731.1
$c_{4,2}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)^2\left(\frac{471499}{110592} - \frac{809}{256}\zeta_4 + \frac{39409}{2304}\zeta_3 - \frac{345}{128}\zeta_5\right)$	=	3329.0
$c_{4,3}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)^3\left(\frac{1205}{18432} - \frac{19}{64}\zeta_3\right)$	=	−697.4

Table 1. *β-function coefficients in the $\overline{\rm MS}$ scheme.*

The BZ expansion can be applied to any perturbatively calculable physical quantity of the form:

$$\mathcal{R} = a\left(1 + r_1 a + r_2 a^2 + r_3 a^3 + \ldots\right). \tag{6}$$

For 'primary' quantities calculated in a 'regular' scheme the coefficients r_i are polynomials in n_f, and hence in a_0:

$$r_i = r_{i,0} + r_{i,1}a_0 + r_{i,2}a_0^2 + \ldots. \tag{7}$$

Note that a term $r_{i,j}a_0^p$ or $c_{i,j}a_0^p$ can be assigned a degree $i + j - p$, and all terms in any formula must have matching degree. [We mention that the same decomposition of coefficients is needed in the "large-b" approximation [12, 13], which employs the opposite limit ($b \to \infty$), rather than $b = \frac{107}{8}a_0 \to 0$ as here.]

The prototypical example is the e^+e^- ratio at a *cm* energy Q:

$$R_{e^+e^-}(Q) \equiv \frac{\sigma_{\rm tot}\left(e^+e^- \to \text{hadrons}\right)}{\sigma\left(e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-\right)}, \tag{8}$$

where, neglecting quark masses, $R_{e^+e^-}(Q) = 3\Sigma q_i^2\,(1 + \mathcal{R}_{e^+e^-})$, and $\mathcal{R}_{e^+e^-}$ has the form of Eq. (6). [We will drop "singlet" terms proportional to $(\Sigma q_i)^2/(3\Sigma q_i^2)$ whose n_f dependence is ambiguous and depends on the electric charges assigned to the additional, fictitious quarks.] The coefficients, calculated in $\overline{\rm MS}$ with the renormalization scale μ equal to Q [14, 15, 4], are collected in the table below.

$r_{1,0}$	=	$\frac{1}{12}$	=	0.0833
$r_{1,1}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)\left(\frac{11}{4} - 2\zeta_3\right)$	=	4.63
$r_{2,0}$	=	$-\frac{12521}{288} + 13\zeta_3$	=	−27.85
$r_{2,1}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)\left(\frac{401}{24} - \frac{53}{3}\zeta_3 + \frac{25}{3}\zeta_5\right)$	=	55.0
$r_{2,2}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)^2\left(\frac{151}{18} - \frac{19}{3}\zeta_3 - \frac{1}{2}\zeta_2\right)$	=	−8.34
$r_{3,0}$	=	$-\frac{3963761}{20736} + \frac{677833}{3456}\zeta_3 - \frac{275}{24}\zeta_5$	=	32.73
$r_{3,1}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)\left(-\frac{38969}{128} + \frac{535}{32}\zeta_2 + \frac{6907}{96}\zeta_3 + \frac{165}{2}\zeta_3^2 + \frac{9595}{144}\zeta_5 - \frac{665}{24}\zeta_7\right)$	=	−402.6
$r_{3,2}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)^2\left(\frac{236089}{1728} - \frac{97}{16}\zeta_2 - \frac{13859}{96}\zeta_3 + \frac{15}{2}\zeta_3^2 + \frac{445}{12}\zeta_5\right)$	=	430.9
$r_{3,3}$	=	$\left(\frac{107}{8}\right)^3\left(\frac{6131}{216} - \frac{33}{8}\zeta_2 - \frac{203}{12}\zeta_3 + 3\zeta_2\zeta_3 - \frac{15}{2}\zeta_5\right)$	=	−1390.0

Table 2. *Coefficients in $\mathcal{R}_{e^+e^-}$ in the $\overline{\rm MS}(\mu = Q)$ scheme.*

The fixed-point condition $\beta(a^*) = 0$ always has a solution as a power series in a_0:

$$a^* = a_0\left(1 + v_1 a_0 + v_2 a_0^2 + v_3 a_0^3 + \ldots\right). \tag{9}$$

A straightforward calculation yields:

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= c_{1,0} + c_{2,-1}, \\ v_2 &= (c_{1,0} + 2c_{2,-1})(c_{1,0} + c_{2,-1}) + c_{2,0} + c_{3,-1}, \\ v_3 &= c_{1,0}^3 + 6c_{1,0}^2 c_{2,-1} + c_{1,0}(3c_{2,0} + 4c_{3,-1} + 10c_{2,-1}^2) \\ &\quad + c_{2,-1}(4c_{2,0} + 5c_{3,-1}) + 5c_{2,-1}^3 + c_{2,1} + c_{3,0} + c_{4,-1}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Numerically, $v_1 = 1.1366$, $v_2 = 23.27$, $v_3 = 18.10$, in the $\overline{\rm MS}$ scheme. Since a^* is RS dependent, the good or bad convergence of this series need not concern us.

A physical quantity $\mathcal{R}$ also has an infrared limit, $\mathcal{R}^*$, given by a power series in a_0. Substituting $a = a^*$ from Eq. (9) into the perturbative expansion of $\mathcal{R}$ and re-expanding in powers of a_0 yields

$$\mathcal{R}^* = a_0\left(1 + w_1 a_0 + w_2 a_0^2 + w_3 a_0^3 + \ldots\right), \tag{11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= v_1 + r_{1,0}, \\ w_2 &= v_2 + 2r_{1,0}v_1 + r_{2,0} + r_{1,1}, \\ w_3 &= v_3 + (2v_2 + v_1^2)r_{1,0} + v_1(2r_{1,1} + 3r_{2,0}) + r_{2,1} + r_{3,0}. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

These coefficients are RS independent. For the e^+e^- case they are

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= \frac{4177}{2^5(107)}, \\ w_2 &= \frac{31250575}{2^9 3(107)^2} - \frac{275}{2(107)}\zeta_3, \\ w_3 &= \frac{2177185161509}{2^{15}3^2(107)^3} - \frac{4232749}{2^6(107)^2}\zeta_3 + \frac{65125}{2^3 3(107)}\zeta_5. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Numerically we find

$$\mathcal{R}^*_{e^+e^-} = a_0\left(1 + 1.22a_0 + 0.23a_0^2 + 25.38a_0^3 + \ldots\right). \tag{14}$$

While the first three terms raise hopes for a well-behaved series, those hopes are dashed by the last term. See Fig. 1.



Fig. 1. $\mathcal{R}^*$ as a function of n_f in the BZ expansion. The curves for 1^{st} to 4^{th} order are shown dotted, dashed, dot-dashed, and solid.

A formulation of the BZ expansion for quantities at a general Q was derived in Ref. [1]. First, we write the integrated β-function equation in the form

$$b\ln\left(\frac{\mu}{\widetilde{\Lambda}}\right) = \frac{1}{a} + c\ln(|c|a) + \int_0^a dx\left(\frac{b}{\beta(x)} + \frac{1}{x^2} - \frac{c}{x}\right). \tag{15}$$

This form, more convenient for c negative, is completely equivalent to our previous definition of the $\tilde{\Lambda}$ parameter [16, 2]. We use a tilde to distinguish $\tilde{\Lambda}$ from the conventional definition of the Λ parameter [17]. The relation is $\ln(\Lambda/\tilde{\Lambda}) = (c/b)\ln(2\,|c\,|/b)$. The two definitions are not dissimilar for small n_f, but they become infinitely different as $n_f \to 16\frac{1}{2}$. In the BZ-expansion context the use of $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is much more convenient.

As explained in Ref. [1], it is convenient to put the β function into the form

$$\frac{b}{\beta\,(x)} = -\frac{1}{x^2} + \frac{c}{x} - \frac{b}{\gamma^*\,(a^* - x)} + H\,(x)\,. \tag{16}$$

where γ^* is the slope of the β function at the fixed point:

$$\gamma^* \equiv \left.\frac{d\beta\,(x)}{dx}\right|_{x=a^*} = -ba^*\left(1 + 2ca^* + 3c_2{a^*}^2 + 4c_3{a^*}^3 + \ldots\right). \tag{17}$$

As discussed below, γ^* can be obtained as a series in a_0. The remainder function $H(x)$ can be expanded as a power series, $H_0 + H_1 x + \ldots$, whose coefficients are of order a_0.

One now inserts (16) into (15) and performs the integration. One can then eliminate a and a^* in favour of $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}^*$. In fact, since the result must be RS invariant, one can — without loss of generality — short-cut this step by utilizing the "effective-charge" RS [18] in which $a \equiv \mathcal{R}$. In n^{th} order of the BZ expansion this leads to the formula [1]:

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}_1(Q) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}} + c\ln\left(|c|\,\mathcal{R}\right) + \frac{b}{\gamma^{*(n)}}\ln\left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{R}^{*(n)}}\right) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-4}\frac{H_i^{(\mathrm{EC})}\mathcal{R}^{i+1}}{i+1}. \tag{18}$$

On the left-hand side, $\boldsymbol{\rho}_1(Q)$ is the RS invariant

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}_1(Q) \equiv b\ln\left(\frac{\mu}{\tilde{\Lambda}}\right) - r_1 \equiv b\ln\left(\frac{Q}{\tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{R}}}\right), \tag{19}$$

where $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a characteristic scale specific to the particular physical quantity $\mathcal{R}$. It is related to the $\tilde{\Lambda}$ parameter of some reference scheme (eg. $\overline{\mathrm{MS}}$) by an exactly calculable factor $\exp(r_1(\mu{=}Q)/b)$ involving the r_1 coefficient in that scheme, evaluated at $\mu = Q$. On the right-hand side the terms involving the $H_i^{(\mathrm{EC})}$ coefficients of the effective-charge scheme are only relevant in fourth order and beyond. Thus, for the first three orders the equation takes the same form, just with the parameters γ^* and $\mathcal{R}^*$ approximated to the appropriate order. At 4^{th} order there is an extra term $H_0^{(\mathrm{EC})}\mathcal{R}$, with $H_0^{(\mathrm{EC})} = H_{0,1}^{(\mathrm{EC})}a_0 + O(a_0^2)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} H_{0,1}^{(\mathrm{EC})} &= \rho_{4,-1} + 2\rho_{2,-1}\rho_{3,-1} + \rho_{2,-1}^3, \\ &= c_{4,-1} + c_{2,-1}(2c_{3,-1} + r_{1,0}^2 - r_{2,0}) + c_{2,-1}^3 \\ &\quad - c_{2,-1}^2 r_{1,0} - c_{3,-1}r_{1,0} - r_{1,0}^3 + 2r_{1,0}r_{2,0} - r_{3,0}, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

$$= \frac{243227350299721}{2^{15}3^4(107)^3} - \frac{5729638277}{2^7 3^3(107)^2}\zeta_3 - \frac{81125}{2^2 3(107)}\zeta_5 \quad \simeq -164.8$$

(in the first line, the $\rho_{i,j}$ are the β-function coefficients of the EC scheme).

The BZ expansion for γ^* is obtained straightforwardly by substituting the expansion of a^* (Eqs. (9) and (10)) into (17). This gives:

$$\gamma^* = b a_0 \left(1 + g_1 a_0 + g_2 {a_0}^2 + g_3 {a_0}^3 + \ldots\right), \tag{21}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 &= c_{1,0}, \\ g_2 &= {c_{1,0}}^2 - {c_{2,-1}}^2 - c_{3,-1}, \\ g_3 &= {c_{1,0}}^3 - 4{c_{2,-1}}^3 - 5c_{1,0}{c_{2,-1}}^2 - 4c_{1,0}c_{3,-1} \\ &\quad - 2c_{2,-1}c_{2,0} - 6c_{2,-1}c_{3,-1} - c_{3,0} - 2c_{4,-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

It is noteworthy that certain terms of degree n are absent in g_n: g_1 does not contain $c_{2,-1}$; g_2 does not contain $c_{2,0}$ or $c_{2,-1}c_{1,0}$; and g_3 does not contain $c_{2,1}$ or $c_{2,0}c_{1,0}$ or $c_{2,-1}{c_{1,0}}^2$.

The values of these invariants are

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 &= \frac{19}{4}, \\ g_2 &= \frac{633325687}{2^{10}3^2(107)^2} - \frac{5335}{2^2(107)}\zeta_3, \\ g_3 &= -\frac{66670528901419}{2^{13}3^4(107)^3} - \frac{1920043907}{2^6 3^3(107)^2}\zeta_3 + \frac{191675}{2^2 3(107)}\zeta_5. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Numerically the γ^* series is:

$$\gamma^* = b a_0 \left(1 + 4.75 a_0 - 8.98 {a_0}^2 - 43.89 {a_0}^3 + \ldots\right). \tag{24}$$

The results, at different orders, are shown in Fig. 2.

Note that γ^* is the 'critical exponent' in the relation $\mathcal{R}^* - \mathcal{R} \propto Q^{\gamma^*}$ that describes how $\mathcal{R}$ approaches $\mathcal{R}^*$ as $Q \to 0$. (γ^* is the infrared limit of an RS-invariant 'effective exponent' $\gamma(Q) \equiv 1 + Q\,\frac{d^2\mathcal{R}}{dQ^2}\Big/\frac{d\mathcal{R}}{dQ} = \frac{d\beta}{da} + \beta(a)\frac{d^2\mathcal{R}}{da^2}\Big/\frac{d\mathcal{R}}{da}$ [19].) As pointed out by Grunberg [7], the g_n coefficients are RS invariants and are universal, in the sense that they are not specific to a particular physical quantity $\mathcal{R}$.

Numerically inverting Eq. (18) provides $\mathcal{R}$ as a function of Q. In the BZ region, $n_f \gtrsim 9$, the resulting $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ has the general form sketched in Fig. 3. At large Q the result naturally agrees with ordinary perturbation theory to the corresponding order. For $Q \sim \tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{R}}$ there is a large "sloping plateau" region, and at ultra-low energies there is a "spike" reaching up to $\mathcal{R}^{*(n)}$.



Fig. 2. γ^* as a function of n_f in the BZ expansion. The curves for 1^{st} to 4^{th} order are shown dotted, dashed, dot-dashed, and solid.



Fig. 3. Typical appearance of $\mathcal{R}$ as a function of Q in the BZ region ($n_f \gtrsim 9$) showing the "spike" at very low energies, the "sloping plateau" region, and the slow approach to asymptotic freedom at very high energies (this region is shown on a log scale). The plateau value $\mathcal{R}_p$ is generally about 0.8 times $\mathcal{R}^*$ but depends on n_f and the BZ-expansion order.

We conclude by showing, in Fig. 4, a comparison of the 4^{th} order BZ expansion with the $\mathcal{R}^*_{e^+e^-}$ results of Ref. [20] in optimized perturbation theory (OPT) [16] and in the EC scheme [18] to order α_s^4. Contrary to the conjecture of Refs. [1, 2], it now appears that the "freezing" behaviour of $\mathcal{R}^*_{e^+e^-}$ at low n_f [21, 22] is not an extrapolation from the BZ region, but a distinct phenomenon.[1] At low n_f one finds that γ^* is around 2 or 3, so that $\mathcal{R}$ "freezes," becoming nearly constant in the infrared region, while it falls rapidly around

[1] At low n_f it appears that different physical quantities may have rather different infrared behaviours [23], unlike the BZ region where there is a high degree of universality.



Fig. 4. $\mathcal{R}^*$ as a function of n_f in the 4^{th} order BZ expansion (dashed curve) compared with OPT (large points) and EC (small points) results from Ref. [20]. The OPT points are shown as blue circles when they arise from a fixed point and as red squares when they arise from an "unfixed point." Error bars indicate the estimated uncertainty in the OPT results. (They are not shown for $n_f = 7, \ldots, 11$, where they would extend well beyond the bounds of the plot.) The dotted blue curve represents $\mathcal{R}^* = 0.9/b$, a purely speculative guess at the large-b form.

$Q \simeq \tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{R}}$. In the BZ region, by contrast, γ^* is small ($\lesssim 1$), resulting in the infrared "spike" of Fig. 3 and the sloping plateau around $Q \simeq \tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{R}}$.

The OPT and EC results in Fig. 4 agree remarkably well at both low and high n_f. In the intermediate region $7 \lesssim n_f \lesssim 13$ they actually differ only at the very lowest energies, because OPT indicates a much more dramatic "spike" in the infrared, of very uncertain size — it could well be even bigger than predicted. This is because the infrared limit in OPT here does not result from a fixed point but from an "unfixed point" and a "pinch mechanism" that leads to $(\mathcal{R}^\star - \mathcal{R}) \propto 1/|\ln Q|^2$, corresponding to $\gamma^* = 0$. For details, see Ref. [20].

Acknowledgment: This note is partly based on unpublished work done in collaboration with Scott Caveny.

References

[1] P. M. Stevenson, Phys. Lett. B **331**, 187 (1994).

[2] S. A. Caveny and P. M. Stevenson, hep-ph/9705319 (unpublished).

[3] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, and J. H. Kühn, arXiv 1606.08659 [hep-ph].

[4] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kühn, and J. Rittinger, arXiv:1206:1288 (2012); P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, and J. H. Kühn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 012002 (2008).

[5] T. Banks and A. Zaks, Nucl. Phys. B **196**, 189 (1982).

[6] A. R. White, Phys. Rev. D **29**, 1435 (1984); in *Hadronic Matter in Collision*, edited by J. Rafelski (World Scientific, 1989); Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **8**, 4755 (1993).

[7] G. Grunberg, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 2228 (1992).

[8] H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1346 (1973); D. J. Gross and F. Wilczek, *ibid.* **30**, 1343 (1973); G. 't Hooft, report at the Marseille Conference Yang-Mills Fields, 1972.

[9] D. R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. B **75**, 531 (1974); W. Caswell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 244 (1974); E. S. Egorian and O. V. Tarasov, Theor. Mat. Fiz. **41**, 26 (1979).

[10] O. V. Tarasov, A. A. Vladimirov, and A. Yu. Zharkov, Phys. Lett. B **93**, 429 (1980); S. A. Larin and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Phys. Lett. B **303**, 334 (1993).

[11] T. van Ritbergen, J. A. M. Vermaseren, and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **400**, 379 (1997).

[12] M. Beneke, Nucl. Phys. B **405**, 424 (1993); D. J. Broadhurst, Z. Phys. C **58**, 339 (1993); K. Van Acoleyen and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. D **69** 125006 (2004).

[13] C. N. Lovett-Turner and C. J. Maxwell, Nucl. Phys. B **432**, 147 (1994); *ibid* **452**, 188 (1995); C. J. Maxwell and D. G. Tonge, *ibid* **481**, 681 (1996); P. M. Brooks and C. J. Maxwell, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 065012 (2006).

[14] K. G. Chetyrkin, A. L. Kataev, and F. V. Tkachov, Phys. Lett. B **85**, 277 (1979); M. Dine and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 668 (1979); W. Celmaster and R. J. Gonsalves, Phys. Rev. D **21**, 3112 (1980).

[15] L. R. Surguladze and M. A. Samuel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 560 (1991); *ibid* 2416 (E); S. G. Gorishny, A. L. Kataev, and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **259**, 144 (1991).

[16] P. M. Stevenson, Phys. Rev. **D23**, 2916 (1981).

[17] W. A. Bardeen, A. J. Buras, D. W. Duke, and T. Muta, Phys. Rev. D **18**, 3998 (1978).

[18] G. Grunberg, Phys. Rev. D **29**, 2315 (1984); A. Dhar and V. Gupta, Phys. Rev. D **29**, 2822 (1984).

[19] P. M. Stevenson, arXiv: 1606.06951 [hep-ph].

[20] P. M. Stevenson, Nucl. Phys. B **875**, 63 (2013).

[21] J. Chýla, A. Kataev, and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **267**, 269 (1991).

[22] A. C. Mattingly and P. M. Stevenson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1320 (1992); Phys. Rev. D **49**, 437 (1994); P. M. Stevenson, Nucl. Phys. B **868**, 38 (2013).

[23] E. Gardi and M. Karliner, Nucl. Phys. B **529**, 383 (1998).